

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	F	ILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/064,842		08/22/2002	Craig E. Burch	201-1581	201-1581 3123	
28787	7590	03/23/2005		EXAM	EXAMINER	
DYKEMA	GOSSET	IT PLLC	ESHETE, Z	ESHETE, ZELALEM		
39577 WOO	DWARD	AVENUE		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
SUITE 300 BLOOMFIE	LD HILL	S, MI 48304		3748		

DATE MAILED: 03/23/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)					
		10/064,842	BURCH ET AL.					
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit					
		Zelalem Eshete	3748					
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app r Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	dress				
THE N - Exten after S - If the - If NO - Failur Any re	DRTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. sions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period to to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute eply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing d patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tir y within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from , cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timely the mailing date of this co (35 U.S.C. § 133).					
Status								
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 F	ebruary 2005.						
2a)⊠	This action is FINAL . 2b) ☐ This	action is non-final.						
•	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.							
Dispositi	on of Claims							
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) 1-24 is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to.							
Applicati	on Papers							
9) 🔲 -	The specification is objected to by the Examine	er.						
10) 🗌 .	10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.							
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).							
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	,	•	` '				
Priority u	nder 35 U.S.C. § 119							
a)[Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bureasee the attached detailed Office action for a list	s have been received. s have been received in Applicat nty documents have been receive u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	ion No ed in this National	Stage				
Attachment	(s)	_						
	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D						
3) 🔲 Inform	e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (P10-948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) 'No(s)/Mail Date)-152)				

This Office Action is in response to the amendment filed on 02/22/2005.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 1-3,5,8,13-16,21-23 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hampton et al. (5,682,848) in view of Wagner et al. (4,823,747).

Regarding claims 1,8,13,23: Hampton discloses a method of assembly and an internal combustion engine cylinder head camshaft bearing ladder, comprising: a combustion chamber; a head with a passageway fluidly connected with said chamber; a valve controlling fluid communication between said chamber and said passageway (see figure 1); a first body in contact with cylinder head with a cut out for receivingly mounting a cam shaft or a cam shaft rotatably mounted on said headon a side of said camshaft generally opposite said combustion chamber by a camshaft bearing ladder, said ladder having a pocket formed therein(see numeral 15), a rocker arm for actuating said valve, said rocker arm having first and second modes of operation of said valve; and a solenoid actuator for actuating said rocker arm between said first and second modes of

operation (see abstract); said first body also having a pocket; and a solenoid actuator positioned within said pocket (see numeral 16) for activating a switchable rocker arm assembly (see figure 1).

Hampton fails to disclose the threaded connection of said body to a cylinder head and to specifically disclose the solenoid pocket is an integral part of the camshaft bearing.

However, Wagner teaches threaded connection of the body to a cylinder head (see figure 3).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Hampton's device by using threaded connection as taught by Wagner in order to secure the body on the engine cylinder head. With regard to the lack of the specific disclosure of an integral pocket/bearing cap, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the pocket (solenoid housing) an integral part of the cam bearing in order to hold the solenoid actuator in place, since it has been held that constructing a formerly various elements into an integral structure involves only routine skill in the art. *Nerwin v. Erlichman, 168 USPQ 177, 179.*

Regarding claims 2,3,14-16,21: Hampton in view of Wagner discloses the claimed invention as recited above except for a plurality of solenoid/camshaft/cutouts. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to duplicate the number of solenoid/camshaft actuation depending on the

number actuated valves in the engine, since it has been held that mere duplication of the essential working parts of a device involves only routine skill in the art. St. Regis

Page 4

Paper Co. v. Bemis Co., 193 USPQ 8.

Regarding claim 3: Wagner discloses a plurality of cut outs for reception of a

plurality of camshafts (see figure 3).

Regarding claim 5: Hampton discloses the solenoid actuator has leads

connected with an "integrated circuit board".

Regarding claim 22: Hampton discloses a method of assembling a portion of a

solenoid actuator to a dual operational rocker arm assembly (see abstract), comprising:

connecting a solenoid (see numeral 16) actuator in a pocket of a camshaft bearing

ladder which receivingly mounts a camshaft on a side of said camshaft on a side of said

camshaft (see numeral 4) on a side of said camshaft generally opposite a combustion

chamber of an internal combustion engine (see figure 1); and positioning said solenoid

actuator adjacent said rocker arm assembly (see figure 1).

Hampton fails to disclose connection of the camshaft bearing ladder to a cylinder

head.

However, Wagner teaches connection of the camshaft bearing ladder to a

cylinder head (see figure 3).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Hampton's device by using threaded connection as taught by Wagner in order to secure the body on the engine cylinder head.

3. Claims 4,9,10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hampton et al. (5,682,848) in view of Wagner et al. (4,823,747), and further in view of Jahr (6,318,318).

Hampton in view of Wagner discloses the claimed invention except it lacks the specification of the solenoid actuator being encapsulated by a polymeric material or epoxy resin.

However, Jahr discloses a core protected by a polymeric plastic encapsulation (see column 5, lines 19-22).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the solenoid of Hampton in view of Wagner by encapsulating it with a polymeric material as taught by Jahr in order to protect the solenoid. It would also have been obvious to choose epoxy resin for it is a strong material as is known by one having ordinary skill in the art.

Application/Control Number: 10/064,842

Art Unit: 3748

4. Claims 5-7,11,12,17-20,24 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hampton et al. (5,682,848) in view of Wagner et al. (4,823,747), and further in view of Yoeda et al. (6,405,693).

Hampton in view of Wagner discloses the claimed invention as recited above and further discloses a control unit or "integrated circuit boards" with leads connected with said solenoid (see numeral 51); a camshaft bearing cap cover penetrated by the connector to allow for electrical connection to said solenoids (see figure 1).

Hampton in view of Wagner fails to disclose "sealably connection" (pass through connector) "integrated/printed circuit board" (encapsulated).

However, Yoeda discloses a control mechanism for controlling valve of internal combustion engine (see figure 4) that shows the use of solenoid (see numerals 30,31) in connection with driving circuit (see numerals 30b,31b) that is controlled by the external output circuit (see numeral 406) of the ECU (see numeral 20).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the control unit of Hampton by implementing circuit board technology as taught by Yoeda thereby incorporating associated connections and encapsulations in order to control the solenoid actuator. It also would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to duplicate the valve actuation arrangement depending on the engine, since it has been held that mere duplication of the essential working parts of a device involves only routine skill in the art. St. Regis Paper Co. v. Bemis Co., 193 USPQ 8.

Response to Arguments

With regard to applicant's argument on pages 7/8: The solenoid actuator which includes armature (35), stator (27), coil (23), plunger (45), solenoid spring (44) are positioned within a pocket (15). The pocket (15) in the reference is no different than applicant's parts solenoid actuator (220), plunger (224) coils (230), solenoid spring (238) received in a pocket. Moreover, the actuator assembly (16) of Hampton has to be rigidly attached to the camshaft bearing ladder due to the large reaction load which has to be transmitted to the pocket (15) and ultimately to the camshaft bearing ladder.

With regard to applicant's argument on pages 8/9: Webster's Ninth New Collegiate Dictionary defines pocket as "a cavity containing a deposit". Applicant also admits that the item (15) encircles the solenoid coil (see page 8). Therefore, Hampton discloses a pocket or "a cavity" within which the solenoid is positioned.

With regard to applicant's argument on page 9: Hampton clearly shows camshaft bearing ladder and cylinder head (see figure 1). Wagner's teaches the connection of the camshaft bearing ladder to a cylinder head by using threaded connection (see figure 3). It would have been obvious to employ Wagner's threaded connection in Hampton for it secures the ladder onto the cylinder head.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Zelalem Eshete whose telephone number is (571) 272-4860. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thomas Denion can be reached on (571) 272-4859. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Application/Control Number: 10/064,842 Page 9

Art Unit: 3748

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Zelalem Eshete Examiner Art Unit 3748

THOMAS DENION
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3700